



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

### III.—PARTICIPIAL PERIPHRASES IN ATTIC PROSE.

Not infrequently in classic Greek we find the combination of a participle with *εἶναι* or *γίγνεσθαι* used when a finite form of the verb represented by the participle might rather have been expected. Such phenomena have nowhere received, I believe, any exhaustive treatment, so that the force of these periphrases has not been clearly determined, much less have the limits of these combinations been fixed either for the whole range of classic Greek or for individual authors. It is true the subject has been incidentally treated in the grammars and commentaries, but such treatment has been based on a range of examples at once too wide and too narrow, and without regard to the very different categories under which they fall. In consequence the deductions are uniformly loose and inadequate, sometimes erroneous and contradictory.<sup>1</sup> Those who see

<sup>1</sup> Kühner (II, §353, 3) says: "Um dem Prädikate ein grösseres Gewicht zu geben, zerlegt die Sprache zuweilen den einfachen Verbal-ausdruck desselben in das Partizip und die Kopula *εἶναι*." Again, "Häufig ist sie auch in der Attischen Prosa wenn eine Handlung als bleibender Zustand bezeichnet werden soll." He also notes the frequency in Plato of *ἔχων εἶναι*. (He should rather have said *εἶναι ἔχων*, 23 cases against 10.) Bernhardt, on the other hand (Syntax, p. 334), considers such expressions are "ohne eine gewählten Sinn (wie die Lateinische Formel dieser Art) oder den Ausdruck der Dauer den man in einzelnen Phrasen, worunter das Platonische *ἐστὶν ἔχων*, zuweilen beabsichtigte. Aber ein *ὢν* neben Participien vermied man als zwecklose Härte und so erkennt man in solchen Stellungen nicht sowohl die participiale als adjective Bedeutung." Krüger (§56) cites indiscriminately a number of examples without offering any explanation. Madvig (I quote from the English translation) says: "Some few present participles, viz., *διαφέρων*, *ἔχων* with an adverb, *προσῆκων*, *πρέπων*, *δέον*, *ἐξόν*, *συνμέρον*, sometimes occur as adjective predicate nouns, with *εἰμί*, or *γίγνομαι*, occasionally also others in connection with an actual adjective." Again, "A participle of the present or aorist with *εἰμί*, as a periphrasis of the simple tense of the verb (in like manner as the partic. pf. under certain circumstances is joined to *εἰμί*) is a poetical licence of not very frequent occurrence; in the prose passages where it does occur there is apt to be a certain emphasis in the several and distinct expression of the action (the partic.) and its existence (*εἰμί*)." Classen, in his Thucyd. (Anhang, Bk. I, 1, 1) draws attention to the different character of these combinations according to the position of *εἶναι*, and observes that only adjectivized participles are used in this way in Thucydides.

no difference between finite and periphrastic forms are wont to refer to Aristotle, Phys. 185 B, with the scholia thereon, and to Metaphys. 4, 7: οὐδὲν γὰρ διαφέρει τὸ ἄνθρωπος ὑγιαίνων ἐστὶν ἢ τὸ ἄνθρωπος ὑγιαίνει ἢ τὸ βαδίζων ἐστὶν ἢ τέμνων τοῦ ἀνθρώπου βαδίζει ἢ τέμνει. Aristotle, however, is speaking from the point of view of formal logic, which regards the universe as made up of classes, and every assertion as the identification of members of one class with members of another; nor does what he say militate against the existence of a different force and tone in the two forms of expression. In this paper I propose to establish such a difference for Attic Prose<sup>1</sup> and to mark clearly the limits in use of such combinations.

In Greek the participle is as thoroughly a verb as the indicative, from which the true participle is distinguished as to function merely by the fact that it makes subsidiary and not principal predications. Apart from the exceptional ἔχων, it is used merely to describe or define its subject, and in only one case (the adjectivized pf. partic. ἐρρωμένος) do we find it compared. As a verb then it has its sphere in indicating motion, activity, and is distinguished from noun and adjective as expressing the manifestation of an action or quality. In virtue, however, of its making subsidiary predications, it may attach itself to nouns which hold subsidiary relations in a sentence, *i. e.* are in oblique cases, and so is declined. Thus approximated to an adjective, it is the form selected whenever it is necessary to use the verb in an adjective relation; but its new character is clearly marked by the article or by τις (indefinite article), and its function is completely changed. τοὺς ἐπαινουμένους πόνους and τοὺς πόνους ἐπαινουμένους differ widely, as in English the force of 'misleading' is by no means the same in "The misleading argument changed his opinion" and "The argument misleading him changed his opinion." Now in periphrases, such as λύων ἐστί, we have an exactly parallel phenomenon; the participle holds a position which usually belongs to an adjective or noun, and, since ἐστί is the sign of predication, the participle must here lack the power of predication and be closely approximated to an adjective.

<sup>1</sup> My conclusions are based on a collection of the cases in the Attic Orators, with the exception of Hyperides and the spurious works of Demosthenes and Aeschines; in Plato except the few spurious pieces in Teubner's 6th vol.; and in Thucydides. In the case of the latter I have used the collections made by Classen, having read three books without being able to add anything to them. Such cases as I find cited in commentaries and elsewhere from Xen. fall easily under the categories established for these writers.

Here then is the clue to the differentiation of *λύει* and *λύων ἐστί*. In the latter case we have an adjective and a copular verb, and hence a permanent quality predicated of the subject; in the former we have an activity or series of activities predicated. This principle we shall find as we proceed to include what fragments of the truth the opinions already quoted contain, and will account for the phenomena they note. But to give definiteness to our results it will be well to throw the cases into their natural categories and then examine each group by itself. It is manifest, in the first place, that the participles of the several tenses do not lend themselves with equal readiness to this use. It will therefore be advantageous to treat separately periphrases into which present, aorist and perfect participles respectively enter.<sup>1</sup> Again, since *εἶναι* in an emphatic position may cease to be purely copular and come to contain the predicate within itself, we will separate cases in which the *εἶναι* (*γίγνεσθαι*) follows the participle from those in which it precedes, and, for convenience, will term the former periphrases of the *First Form*, the latter of the *Second Form*.

#### PRESENT PARTICIPLE. *First Form.*

Under this head we have to consider such periphrases as *λύων ἐστί*, which, according to the principle just laid down, asserts the existence of a certain quality in the subject in contradistinction to the predication of an action or series of actions on the part of the subject. Supposing this to be true, is there any demand in the language for periphrases with such a function? There is, provided the language has not an adjective already formed for the expression of every conception which under any circumstances might possibly come to be regarded as a quality. A stock of adjectives sufficient to cover such a proviso, the language of course does not possess. There are, in the first place, certain verbs in Greek expressing the manifestation of a quality while at the same time no adjective exists for the expression of the quality itself. Such verbs, *e. g.*, as *προσῆκειν*, *πρέπειν* (cf. Lat. *convenit*, *decet*, and Eng. 'becomes,' 'befits'), *διαφέρειν*, *συμφέρειν* and *ὁμολογεῖσθαι*. In each of these cases the quality in question has no existence in a single object but in relation to two objects, and the coming together of the two objects was, by the earlier language-users, regarded as the

<sup>1</sup> The fut. partic. scarcely occurs. I have noted one case, Pl. Tim. 38 B, where the periphrasis results from symmetry.

manifestation of the quality. The truth of this view is confirmed by the patent etymology of *προσῆκειν*, *συμφέρειν*, *convenit*, 'becomes.' In process of time the conception of the quality apart from its manifestation became more prominent, and to express this quality itself the participle was very naturally employed. Meanwhile the feeling for the etymology became dulled and the distinct notion of an activity faded from the verb itself, so that in the main the manifestation of a quality expressed by *προσῆκει* is equivalent to the existence of it expressed by *προσῆκων ἐστί*.<sup>1</sup>

But, in the second place, besides these cases, the language often felt the need of embodying the conception of a verb as a quality, especially when the signification of the verb naturally lends itself to an adjective use. Pl. Phil. 37 E affords an example; *ἂν δέ γε ἀμαρτανόμενον τὸ δοξαζόμενον* ἦ, "If the thing opined is *erroneous*"; or, again, in verbs where also the activity is in the main a fiction, but which express not so much the existence of a quality as of a permanent condition, *e. g.* *ἔχων*, *ὑπάρχων* (*vid.* Isoc. Epist. 9, 13; Pl. Rep. 458 A). These periphrases then of the type *ἀμαρτανόμενον ἐστί* and *ἔχων ἐστί*, I group together as a second class, since, while the participles contained have not become thoroughly adjectivized like those of the first class, they yet share the peculiarity of having something in their signification which renders the use of the periphrastic form a natural one.

Thirdly, we group together such participles as have nothing in their signification which would lead them to be used as adjectives, but are nevertheless occasionally so used in these periphrases: *e. g.* Pl. Nom. 963 A, *πρὸς γὰρ ἐν ἔφαμεν δεῖν αἰεὶ πάνθ' ἡμῖν τὰ τῶν νόμων βλέποντ' εἶναι*. Such periphrases are not intended to bring before the mind any definite action, but to give a characteristic of the subject or describe it. In Phaedo 82 A, *οὐκοῦν εὐδαιμονέστατοι καὶ τούτων εἰσὶ καὶ εἰς βέλτιστον τόπον ἴοντες οἱ τὴν δημοτικὴν τε καὶ πολιτικὴν ἀρετὴν ἐπιτετηθευκότες*, the parallelism of the adjective clearly indicates the function of the participle. It must be noted that characteristic may also be expressed by the finite tenses of continuance, which assert the customary manifestation of an action or quality, for this is, roughly speaking, equivalent to the assertion of the existence

<sup>1</sup> I do not believe that in general any difference can be discovered in the use of the finite and periphrastic forms of verbs whose participles are so thoroughly adjectivized as *προσῆκων*, etc., *e. g.* Pl. Ion 540; but it may occasionally be apparent, *e. g.* Alcib. I 116 D, ΣΩ. *Τὰ δὲ ἀγαθὰ συμφέρειν*; ΑΔ. *Ναί*. ΣΩ. *Τὰ δίκαια ἄρα συμφέροντά ἐστιν*.

of the corresponding characteristic or quality in the subject. The finite form includes the periphrastic; not conversely. The finite form has other functions and lacks definiteness; the periphrastic is an accurate expression for the existence of an aptitude or tendency, not necessarily manifesting itself, but, it may be, merely potential. The conception, however, of a quality apart from its manifestation is an abstraction, very necessary to the philosophic thinker, but not likely to be much used in practical life, where acts, not potentially existent tendencies, are of prime importance.

In the following list of occurrences in the Orators of periphrases of the first form containing a present partic., such cases as Dem. 3, 25 are kept by themselves: οὕτω σώφρονες ἦσαν καὶ σφόδρα ἐν τῷ πολιτείας ἤθει μένοντες ὥστε . . . Here the participle is parallel to an adjective<sup>1</sup> which precedes it, and by that parallelism at the same time the function of the participle is clearly indicated and any harshness there may be in the combination is mitigated.

ἀναδεχόμενος, Dem. 19, 37; ἀρκῶν (4 times), Ant. 2, β, 2; 2, γ, 3; 2, δ, 10; 4, γ, 6;<sup>2</sup> δημοκρατούμενος, Dem. 24, 5; διαφέρων (7), Ant. 5, 88; 6, 6; Isoc. 7, 45; 12, 120; Epist. 2, 3; Aesch. 3, 162; 3, 168; ἐκστρατεύονοι, Lycurg. 107; ἔχων (2), Isoc. Epist. 9, 13; Dem. 31, 11; ὁμολογούμενος (5), Isoc. 6, 14; Isae. 2, 40; Din. 1, 90; Lycurg. 36; Dem. 20, 32; ποιούμενος, Dem. 19, 37; πρέπων (6), Lys. 3, 9; 19, 59; Isoc. 6, 90; 15, 74; Epist. 5, 3; 6, 7; προσήκων (5), Isoc. 12, 124; Isae. 7, 14; Dem. 45, 49; 69; 48, 6; συμφέρων (8), Lys. 12, 7; Isoc. 14, 25; Epist. 5, 3; Lycurg. 37; Dem. 16, 10; 19, 75; 161; 24, 24.<sup>3</sup>

Total number of cases 41, in which 11 different participles appear. In addition to these we have 25 cases where the participle is parallel to a preceding adjective:

Isoc. 6, 72 (ἀρμόττοντα); 8, 36 (προσῆκον); 12, 183 (πρέπων); 15, 47 (δυνάμενος); 77 (πρέπων); 91 (δυνάμενος); 187 (διαφέρων); Aesch. 3, 28\*<sup>4</sup> (λύων); 1, 141 (περιφρονῶν); Dem. 3, 25 (μένων); 19, 25 (ὑπερβάλλων); 20, 8 (πρέπον); 55\* (ποιοῦντες); 153 (καλῶς ἔχων); 157 (κακῶς ἔχων); 21, 66 (συμφέρον); 201\* (μέγα φρονῶν, μέγα φθεγγόμενος);

<sup>2</sup> In some cases a noun, with of course no essential difference (*vid.* Pl. Sym. 191 D). I also include those cases in which a pf. participle precedes.

<sup>3</sup> ἄρχων is conjectured [And.] 4, 30. Since it has become a noun I have not noted all occurrences of this word.

<sup>4</sup> In this and following lists *κείμενος* and its compds. are not included, inasmuch as they were regarded and treated as pfs.

<sup>5</sup> In the cases marked thus \* the copula is not expressed.

22, 11 (συμφέρων); 23, 139 (πρέπων); 24, 90 (κάκιον ἔχων); 187 (ἀδίκως ἔχων); 189 (καλῶς ἔχων); 34, 16 (μαινόμενον); 35, 46 (ὑπερβάλλον).

Altogether we have 66 cases. In the 41 which are not introduced by the parallel adjective we find 31 which contain the thoroughly adjectivized participles, διαφέρων, συμφέρων, πρέπων, προσήκων,<sup>1</sup> ὁμολογούμενος. The extent to which they have become adjectivized is illustrated in Aesch. 3, 162, οὗτος γὰρ ὁ νεανίσκος ἐτέρων τὴν ὄψιν διαφέρων γενόμενος, and in Isoc. 7, 45. This combination of a participle with a partic. is extremely rare (cf. Nom. 779 E); it will be noted, however, that in both cases, had the finite form been used, it must have been the aorist, the tense least of all fitted to express the existence of a quality. ὁμολογούμενος is not, perhaps, so completely an adjective as the others, and might be classed in the second group, for the three groups are not divided by hard and fast lines, but shade into one another. In cases like the following, however, ὁμολογούμενος is as thoroughly adjective as πρέπων. Isoc. 6, 14, τὸ γὰρ . . . δι' ἡμῶν αὐτῶν πειρᾶσθαι σώζεσθαι . . . ὁμολογούμενον τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς τῆς πόλεως ἔργοις ἐστίν.

In the second group we put ἔχων, from which the notion of activity has faded (e. g. in καλῶς ἔχων); witness such an expression as ἀφρόνως ἀλλὰ νοῦν ἐχόντως (Isoc. Epist. 5, 2). To the same group belongs also ἀρκῶν. We have thus left but four cases which may be considered to fall into the third group. Of these, the adj. force of δημοκρατουμένην in Dem. 24, 5 is sufficiently apparent, where he speaks of the city 'being *democratic* and free,' δημοκρατουμένην καὶ ἐλευθέραν εἶναι. In 19, 37 Demosthenes is not referring to any particular assertions of Philip, but describing the character in which Philip appears in a certain letter: πάντα ἀναδεχόμενος καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ποιούμενος τὰ τούτων ἀμαρτήματά ἐστιν. Again, Lycurgus (107) tells that the Spartans are summoned to hear the poems of Tyrtaeus, ὅταν ἐν τοῖς ὅπλοις ἐκστρατευόμενοι ᾄσι,<sup>2</sup> where there is no reference to a definite act, but to a condition; not 'when they are in the act of marching,' but 'when they are on the march.'

The cases of periphrases of the first form in Thucydides contain, as Classen observes, only adjectivized participles.<sup>3</sup> The passage,

<sup>1</sup> In Dem. 48, 6 it has the sense 'related,' which is no less adapted, than the usual one, to periphrastic expression.

<sup>2</sup> Heinrich needlessly reads ἴωσι.

<sup>3</sup> In Thucy. I, 1, 1 Classen reads ἀκμάζοντες ἦσαν ἐς . . . for ἦσαν . . . unnecessarily as it seems to me. The adj. meaning of ἀκμάζοντες renders the periphrasis natural, and Classen's objection that ἐς with its idea of 'bestimmung' is then out of place, does not hold.

1, 38, 4 is worthy of note, since there ἀρέσκοντές ἐσμεν and ἀπαρέσκοιμεν ᾧν are used side by side, the former of an abiding quality which characterized the relations of the Corinthians and their colonies, whilst the latter refers to certain special acts. To the limitation of periphrases to adjectivized participles there may be one exception, unless Cobet's emendation of μεταπεπεμμένοι for MS μεταπεμπομένοι be adopted. As the passage stands, there is, according to the principles enunciated here, no fitness in the periphrasis; but a slight change of the masc. to neuter ending, -οι to -α, would bring it into accord with them, and the meaning would be 'such things as were imported.' But, as there is nowhere else in Thucy. so striking a case of periphrasis, I would prefer Cobet's reading.<sup>1</sup>

I now pass to a list of the occurrences in Plato: αἰσθανόμενος (4), Theaet. 159 E; 160 B (*ter*); ἀγόμενον (2), Euthyph. 10 B (*bis*); ἀμαρτανόμενον, Phil. 37 E; ἀνομολογούμενος, Gorg. 495 A; ἀποπληρῶν, Nom. 932 B; ἀρμόττων, Nom. 808 B; ἄρχων (2), Rep. 558 D; Tim. 44 A; ἀρχόμενος, Nom. 715 D; βλέπων, Nom. 963 A; γιγνόμενος (6), Euthyph. 10 C (*bis*): Craty. 411 D; Phil. 42 D; Hip. Maj. 297 C; Nom. 935 D; δεόμενος, Nom. 768 E; δέον (7), Nom. 649 C (*bis*); 793 E; 796 C; 800 E; 802 DE; Epin. 990 C; διαφέρων (8), 719 D; 720 E; 729 C; 743 C; 779 E; 794 D; 901 B; Epin. 987 C; διαφθειρόμενος, Rep. 492 A; διαφθείρων, Rep. 492 A; δρῶν, Tim. 33 D; ἐγγιγνόμενος, Theaet. 187 D; ἐλλείπων (2), Theaet. 157 E; Nom. 960 D; ἐπιτρέπων, Nom. 932 B; ἐπόμενος (6), Pol. 271 B; Rep. 412 B; 461 E; Tim. 42 A; 54 D; Nom. 716 D; ἔχων (10), Craty. 386 D; 391 A; Soph. 253 C; Parm. 165 A; Tim. 66 A; Nom. 713 B; 735 D; 798 E; 860 E; 967 A; ἐχόμενα, Nom. 828 A; ἡγεμονοῦν, Nom. 631 C; θηριούμενος, Nom. 935 A; κακουργῶν, Nom. 933 A; κατέχων, Tim. 52 B; κινούμενα, Soph. 249 B; λεγόμενος, Nom. 719 C; λειπόμενον, Nom. 807 A; λυσιτελῶν, Nom. 662 C; μαινόμενος (2), Prot. 350 B; Nom. 934 C; μετέχων (2), Tim. 58 D; Nom. 859 E; μισοῦντες, Nom. 908 B; ὁμολογούμενος (2), Craty. 387 D; Phil. 12 A; ὁμονοῶν, Nom. 759 B; ὀρώμενος (4), Euthyph. 10 B (*bis*); Tim. 56 C; Epin. 984 E; ὀρῶν, Theaet. 164 A; ὀφειδόμενος, Rep. 332 A; ὀφλῶν, Nom. 909 B; παρεπόμενος, Nom. 667 D; παρέχων, Tim. 33 D; πάσχων (4), Euthyph. 10 C (*bis*); Theaet. 157 A; Tim. 33 CD; ποιῶν, Theaet. 157 A; πρέπων (23), Lach. 188 D; Gorg. 504 A; Hip. Maj. 291 C; Tim. 21 A; 33 B; Critias 112 B; 117 A; Nom. 665 D; 670 D; 755 C; 764 C; 779 C (*bis*); 796 C;

<sup>1</sup> Herbst (pp. 37-9) attacks Cobet's emendation, but fails egregiously in making his point.



800 E; 801 E; 804 E; 818 A; 855 A; 917 A; 920 E; 950 C; 956 A; προσήκων (10), Phil. 36 D; Phaedr. 227 C; Rep. 404 A; 442 D; 525 B; Nom. 713 C; 724 B; 751 B; 775 A; 904 E; συμφέρων (6), Phil. 63 A; Alcib. I 114 E; 116 D; Hip. Maj. 290 C (dis); Ion 540 C; συνεπόμενος (2), Critias 117 A; Nom. 858-9 A; συνέχοντα, Soph. 253 C; τιθέμενος, Nom. 822 E; υπάρχων (4), Rep. 458 A; Nom. 774 C; 846 E; 923 D; φερόμενος (4), Euthyph. 10 B (ter); Soph. 249 B; φιλούμενος (4), Euthyph. 10 A; C (dis); D; χαίρων, Alcib. II 139 C; ᾧν (5), Soph. 240 B; 245 C; 256 D; 263 B; Tim. 38 B.

Total number of cases 151, in which 53 different partic. occur. In addition we have 58 cases where a parallel adj. precedes:

Euthyph. 5 D (ἔχον); Apol. 40 A (ἐναντιούμενη); Phaedo 82 A (ιόντες); Craty. 408 C\* (οἰκούν); 440 A (ἔχον); Theaet. 178 C (πυρέττων); 182 B (αἰσθανόμενος); Soph. 225 A\* (πρέπον); 229 D (ἔχον); Parm. 144 A (μετέχων); 145 A\* (ἔχον); 150 A (περιέχουσα); 159 A\* (κινούμενα); 166 B\* (ἀπτόμενα); Symp. 175 E (ἔχουσα); 206 D (ἀρμόττον); Alcib. II 139 D (παιόμενος καὶ βαλλόμενος); Anter. 135 B (προσῆκον); Charm. 169 E (γινώσκων) dis; Lach. 188 D (ἀρμόττον); Prot. 349 D (διαφέρων); Gorg. 493 E (ἐκποριζόμενα); Meno 72 B (διαφέρων); Hip. Maj. 289 E (ἀποδεχόμενος); Rep. 423 C (δοκούσα); 441 E (πράττων); 524 B (δεόμενα); 552 E (ἔχων); 568 A (διαφέρων); 571 C\* (ἄρχων); 577 E (πενόμενος); 596 D\* (δημιουργόμενος); Tim. 36 E\* (μετέχων); 44 D (δεσποτοῦν); 87 C\* (πρέπον); Nom. 625 A\* (πρέπον); 666 E (δυνάμενος); 716 D (πρέπον); 723 C (διαφέρων); 732 B (λεγόμενα); 747 C (προσῆκον); 763 D (σκολάζων); 765 A (ἀποδιδούς); 775 D\* (ἐχόμενα); 781 D (πρέπων); 798 D (δεόμενα); 821 A (συμφέρων); 837 B\* (ἔχων); 875 D (ἄρχων); 875 E (διαφέρων); 876 C\* (ἔχων); 892 BC (ἀρχόμενα); 976 D (ἄρχων, ἀρχόμενος); Epin. 981 E (ὀρώμενα); 992 C\* (μετέχων).

It is Plato who affords the best field for the investigation of these forms, inasmuch as he employs them not only with accuracy but with freedom. In Euthyphro the argument hinges on the distinction between φιλούμενόν ἐστι and φιλεῖται. Euthyphro has defined (9 E) τὸ ὅσιον as 'that which the gods love.' Whereupon Socrates asks, "Is that which is holy, loved by the gods, because it is holy, or holy, because it is loved by the gods?" and illustrates his meaning thus; τὸ φερόμενον, διότι φέρεται, φερόμενόν ἐστιν . . . οὐκ ἄρα διότι ὀρώμενόν γέ ἐστι, διὰ τοῦτο ὀράται, ἀλλὰ τουναντίον διότι ὀράται, διὰ τοῦτο ὀρώμενον, i. e. 'It is not because a thing possesses the quality of visibility, that it is seen, but because it is seen, the quality of visi-

bility is predicated of it.' He then makes the general statement : *εἴ τι γίγνεται ἢ τι πάσχει τι, οὐχ ὅτι γιγνόμενόν ἐστι, γίγνεται ἀλλ' ὅτι γίγνεται, γιγνόμενόν ἐστιν : οὐδ' ὅτι πάσχον ἐστί, πάσχει, ἀλλ' ὅτι πάσχει, πάσχον ἐστίν.* This simply asserts that we predicate the general characteristic or quality in consequence of the several concrete manifestations, and not conversely. We have not space to pursue the argument, but this suffices to illustrate the use Plato makes of periphrases in philosophic discussion. And so frequently, *e. g.* Soph. 249 B, *φερόμενα καὶ κινούμενα πάντ' εἶναι, ἰ. e.* 'All things are *capable of* motion'; Theaet. 159 E foll. *αἰσθανόμενος γίγνομαι*, 'I become perceptive.' Note especially Tim. 56 C where *ὁρώμενόν [ἐστίν]* is used of what is capable of being seen, and *ὁρᾶσθαι* of what is actually seen ; also the frequent employment of *εἶναι* to express the highest philosophic reality or absolute truth, *e. g.* Soph. 256 D ; again, *ποιοῦν* and *πάσχον* (agent and patient), Theaet. 157 A. But, apart from the absolute needs of scientific accuracy, Plato employs these periphrases freely. There are, in the 151 cases, 49 into which principles of the first group enter. In the second group we may place *δεῖον* (7 times), *δεομένη* (1), *ἐλλείπων* (2), *ὑπάρχων* (4), *λειπόμενος* (1), *ἔχων* (10), *ἐχόμενα*<sup>1</sup> (1), and the following used in an adjective sense, *ὁμονοῶν* (1), *συνεπόμενος* (2), *ἀνομολογούμενος* (1), *κακοεργῶν* (1), *λυσιτελῶν* (1), *μεινόμενος* (2), *ἀμαρτανόμενον* (1), *ἀρμόττων* (1), *χαίρων*, 'scot-free' (1), *ἐπόμενος* (6), *ὦν*<sup>2</sup> (5), *θηριούμενος* (1), *αἰσθανόμενος*<sup>3</sup> (4), *ὁρώμενος*<sup>2</sup> (4), *ἄρχων* (2), *ἀρχόμενος* (1), *λεγόμενος*, 'traditional' (1).<sup>3</sup> For typical examples *vid.* Critias 117 A ; Prot. 350 B ; Nom. 715 D.

Some 40 cases still remain to be disposed of and these will fall into our third group, where, since the adj. character is not stamped on the partic. itself, it is necessary to quote the context in order to show the force of the periphrasis ; this space does not permit, and I will have to limit myself to one or two cases. Nom. 822 DE, *οὐ γὰρ ἄρρητὰ φάμεν εἶναι, λέγοντες τὸ<sup>4</sup> αὐτὰ ὡς νόμους οἷσθαι τιθεμένους εἶναι πολλῆς ἀνοίας γέμειν, ἰ. e.* "For we do not say that such subjects are not to be spoken of at all, when we say it is a great absurdity to consider them, like laws, *to be matters such as are to be laid down in legislation.*" Rep. 332 A, *καίτοι γε ὀφειλόμενον πού ἐστι τοῦτο, ὃ παρακατέθετο.* Nom. 935 D, *ὅποταν θυμῷ γιγνόμενον ᾗ*, "when-ever it is of the kind that is done in anger." *γίγνόμενον* is frequent

<sup>1</sup> Nom. 828 A, where it is quite colorless.

<sup>2</sup> Mentioned above.

<sup>3</sup> Nom. 719 C., cf. 782 D, Tim. 21 A.

<sup>4</sup> So I read instead of *τε*, which involves a clumsy anacoluthon (Stall. ad loc.) The variations in text do not affect the periphrasis.

in periphrases in the sense of 'phenomenon,' *vid.* Hip. Maj. 297 C. There seems to be a tendency to use *γινόμενον* where it is not absolutely required, *vid.* Theaet. 187 D, Phil. 42 D. These two passages are, of all that I have found, the least satisfactorily accounted for by the theory. For further examples see Tim. 33 C, 52 B, 58 D (cf. Nom. 859 E), Soph. 253 C, Rep. 492 D, Craty. 411 D, Nom. 667 D, 631 C, 909 B, etc. In all cases it will be found that the main object of the writer is to describe or characterize, not to assert particular acts. It will be remembered that the periphrastic form is not absolutely necessary; sometimes finite and periphr. appear side by side, Nom. 932 AB; 908 B. Symmetry of structure is occasionally a factor, Theaet. 164 A; in one long sentence (Parm. 157 AB), consisting of corresponding clauses, it has brought about the employment of the periphrasis where, according to the theory here advanced, the periphrasis ought not to be used. Two other passages which do not harmonize with the theory, Hip. Maj. 286 B and Cleit. 410 A, are accounted for by the post-classical date of these dialogues (*vid.* Gildersleeve's Justin Martyr, p. 143).<sup>1</sup>

### Second Form.

When *εἶναι* (*γίγνεσθαι*) is thrown into an emphatic position it ceases to be a colorless copula, and acquires a new force which varies according to circumstances. But the position of *εἶναι* before the partic. may be merely incidental, so that it acquires no emphasis, and in this case (*a*) the periphrasis does not at all differ from those already examined; nor need the second form differ from the first, when the *εἶναι* becomes merely an emphatic copula. On the other hand, if full stress is given, the mind dwells on the *εἶναι* rather than on the partic., and in it we must look for the *raison d'être* of the periphrasis. Characterization, if it exists, in such a case is wholly secondary. The resolution into periphrasis arises from the mind's being occupied with the *εἶναι* factor; the participle comes in afterwards to complete the sense. Under this head we have two categories, either (*b*) the *εἶναι* is an emphatic assertion, 'is really,'

<sup>1</sup> Not every passage where *εἶναι* and a partic. come together is to be considered periphr., e. g. Gorg. 469 D (quotation), Craty. 405 (exigencies of etymology), Phil. 48 D (corrupt). Elsewhere the partic. may be construed separately, and here differences of opinion may arise. I give the excluded passages which offer most room for doubt: Rep. 502 D; Pol. 29 C, cf. B; Gorg. 523 B; Nom. 822 C; 871 C; 909 E; Phil. 33 B.

'actually,' or (*c*) contains a predicate in itself, meaning 'exists,' or in the case of *γίγνεσθαι* 'comes into being.' The construction of the participle here is analogous to that which it has with *φαίνομαι*, and shades off into the ordinary use of a participle of circumstance, so that it may be a matter of doubt whether the participle depends on the subject immediately or through the verb. It is manifest then that while cases under the head of *a* will have the same limitations as in the first form, those in *b*, and more especially in *c*, will be used more freely without limitations as to the nature of the participle. We noted, under the first form, the tendency towards periphrasis in verbs like *ἔχων* which express a permanent condition. Since the emphasizing of *εἶναι* gives still more prominence to the idea of existence and permanence, we may expect to find such verbs even more frequently in periphr. of the second form.

The following is the list of occurrences in the Orators: *ἀμφισβητῶν*, Isoc. 15, 57; *ἐπαυξάνοντα*, Dem. 3, 33; *ἔχων* (6), Isoc. 5, 110; 15, 117; Din. 1, 90; Dem. 20, 18; 113; 23, 73; *λεγόμενος*, Isoc. 12, 119; *ὁμολογούμενος* (3), Isae. 1, 38; 8, 20; Dem. 55, 19; *παρακαλῶν*, Isoc. 15, 57; *περίον*, Dem. 36, 8; *πρέπων*, Isoc. 5, 110; *προσῆκων* (6), Isoc. 5, 110; 15, 188; Dem. 3, 24; 4, 38; 21, 196; 22, 33; *συμφέρων* (3), Isoc. 5, 16; Lycurg. 140; Aesch. 2, 57; *ὑπάρχων* (3), Lys. 13, 91; Aesch. 3, 208; Dem. 20, 25; *ὑποδεχόμενος*, Dem. 55, 19; *ὑπολειπόμενος*, Dem. 50, 24.

Total 29, in which 13 different participles are used.

There are 14 additional cases where an adjective precedes: Andoc. 1, 4 (*ὑπάρχων*);<sup>1</sup> Isoc. 12, 135 (*προσῆκων*); Epist. 9, 19 (*συμφέρον*); Dem. 19, 202 (*προσῆκων*); 294 (*δεόμενα*); 312 (*μισῶν*); 20, 94 (*συμφέρον*); 21, 70 (*προσῆκων*); 114 (*διορίζων*); 185 (*ἐλεῶν, ὑβρίζων*); 22, 73 (*ἔχων*); 24, 181 (*ἔχων*); 29, 13 (*προσποιοῦμενος*).

Since space is lacking to discuss cases which exhibit peculiarities similar to those of the first form, it will suffice to cite an example of the emphatic copula in connection with a partic. which is clearly characterizing: Dem. 3, 33, *ἀλλ' ἔστι ταῦτα τὴν ἐκάστου βᾶθυμίαν ἐπαυξάνοντα*. Also Isoc. 15, 57; 117. Let us rather note some cases where the periphrasis has arisen, not from the desire to characterize, but from the need of employing the other factor of the combination. Aesch. 3, 208, *δυοῖν θάτερον ὑπάρξαι δεῖ, ὧν οὐδέτερον ἔστι Δημοσθένει ὑπάρχον*. Cf. Dem. 20, 25; Lys. 13, 91. Again, Isae. 1, 38, *ἡμᾶς δ' οἷς ἔστιν ἀμφότερα ταῦτα παρὰ πάντων ὁμολογούμενα* . . .

<sup>1</sup> MSS read in this passage also *διδομένη*, which cannot stand. Some editors strike it out altogether, better read *δεδομένη*.

Or Dem. 50, 24, οὐκ ἔστι πρόφασις ὑπολειπομένη, cf. 55, 19. In this last cited case the participle is quite secondary, but is yet predicate. Such a construction can of course be used with perfect freedom and we are far from the periphrases with which we started. In Thucydides there are some good illustrations of the secondary character of the partic. ; 4, 109, 2 ; 8, 69, 3 ; 2, 80, 3. In 2, 67, 1 and 8, 92, 4, the participles may be taken independently of the verb as in the ordinary participial construction, or perhaps less naturally as predicates. In 1, 99, 2, characterization predominates.

Let us turn now to Plato. The following is the list of occurrences: ἀγνοῶν, Phaedr. 239 B ; ἄγων, Phaedr. 237 D ; αἰσθανόμενος, Theaet. 159 E ; ἀκούμενος, Tim. 26 BC ; ἀντιτιθέμενος, Soph. 257 D ; ἀποδιδόμενος, Nom. 768 A ; ἄρχων, Phaedr. 237 D ; γέμων, Nom. 807 C ; γιγνόμενος (16), Euthyph. 5 E ; Pol. 301 D ; Parm. 152 B ; Phil. 39 A ; 39 C ; 42 A ; Phaedr. 274 A ; Lys. 213 C ; Prot. 356 A ; Tim. 38 B ; Nom. 729 B ; 800 C ; 805 E ; 901 C ; 959 E ; Epin. 985 B ; δέόμενος, Nom. 913 A ; δέον (2), Tim. 42 D ; Nom. 713 B ; διαδιδόμενος, Tim. 77 E ; διαιρούμενος, Nom. 895 E ; διαφέρων (7), Parm. 154 D ; Alcib. II 149 B ; Gorg. 500 C ; Nom. 696 B ; 733 BC ; 861 B ; 963 B ; δοκῶν, Phil. 51 A ; δοξάζων, Soph. 240 D ; δυνάμενος, Nom. 937 E ; ἐλλειπόμενος, Soph. 258 B ; ἐνών, Rep. 431 E ; ἐπιμελούμενος, Epin. 980 D ; ἐπιτηδευόμενος, Rep. 527 B ; ἐπόμενος, Nom. 763 C ; ἔχων (23), Phaedo 92 D ; Soph. 258 B ; 287 E ; 297 E ; Pol. 306 B ; Phil. 48 C ; 59 B ; Phaedr. 245 E ; Prot. 330 E ; Gorg. 484 A ; Meno 82 C (*bis*) ; Hip. Min. 368 E ; Rep. 397 B ; 602 C ; Nom. 663 D ; 743 A ; 747 D ; 770 C ; 857 B ; 876 E ; 892 C ; 896 A ; καλούμενος, Nom. 961 D ; κινούμενος, Theaet. 153 D ; λεγόμενος (11), Soph. 257 D ; Pol. 302 C ; Phil. 11 B ; 26 E ; Rep. 490 A ; 588 B ; Tim. 90 E ; Nom. 773 C ; 855 A ; 881 B ; Epin. 981 A ; μέλον, Nom. 766 C ; μετέχων (3), Pol. 273 B ; Parm. 141 A ; Rep. 396 E ; μεταβάλλων, Nom. 894 E ; νομοθετούμενος, Nom. 834 B ; νομοθετοῦντες, Nom. 692 B ; νοσοῦντες, Alcib. II 139 D ; οἰκούμενος, Rep. 521 A ; ὁρώμενος, Epin. 985 B ; παρεπόμενος, Theag. 128 D ; παρών, Phaedr. 272 A ; περιέχων, Parm. 138 A ; περιφερόμενος, Rep. 402 D ; ποιούμενος, Theaet. 143 D ; πολιτεύόμενος, Nom. 676 B ; ποριζόμενος, Rep. 364 B ; πρέπων (8), Tim. 17 B ; Nom. 627 C ; 756 B ; 767 B ; 931 D ; 944 E ; 945 B ; 948 C ; πρεσβευόμενος, Nom. 879 C ; πρᾶττόμενος (2), Nom. 736 B ; 870 D ; προσήκων, Nom. 902 C ; συμφέρων, Rep. 338 D ; συνοικῶν, Nom. 848 A ; τείνων (2), Pol. 308 E ; Meno 84 B ; τιθέμενος, Nom. 963 A ; υπερέχων, Nom. 696 B ; φέρων (2), Nom. 811 B ; Alcib. II

142 B; *ψυχόμενος*, Phaedo 118 A; *ᾧν* (15), Soph. 237 A; 245 D; 256 E; 259 A; Parm. 141 A; 162 A (*τερ*); Phil. 51 A; Phaedr. 247 E; Tim. 38 BC (*δῖς*); 61 D; Nom. 771 C; 894 A.

133 cases in which 53 different participles are used.

There are 14 additional cases where an adj. precedes: Soph. 258 C (*ῥν*); Parm. 141 A (*ἔχον*); 141 E (*μετέχον*); Symp. 191 D (*ἐπιχειρῶν*); Alcib. I 114 B (*συμφέρων*); 116 DE (*συμφέρων*); Meno 99 E (*παραγινόμενη*); Rep. 374 E (*δεόμενον*); 556 A (*ἀναγκάζων*); Critias 112 A (*ἔχων*); Nom. 649 D (*γέμων*); 840 AB (*σφριγῶντες*); 918 C (*δεόμενον*); Epin. 981 E (*ἔχον*).

The number of these latter cases is small as compared with the similar ones in the first form, an indication of the less uniformly adjective character of periphrases in the second form. A further confirmation of this is to be had from a comparison of the most frequently recurring participles in each form. These are for the first, the thoroughly adjectivized:

|          | <i>πρέπων</i> | <i>προσήκων</i> | <i>διαφέρων</i> | <i>συμφέρων</i> | <i>Total.</i> |
|----------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|
| 1st Form | 23            | 10              | 8               | 6               | 47            |
| 2d "     | 8             | 1               | 7               | 1               | 17            |

For the second:

|         | <i>ἔχων</i> | <i>γινόμενος</i> | <i>ᾧν</i> | <i>λεγόμενος</i> | <i>Total.</i> |
|---------|-------------|------------------|-----------|------------------|---------------|
| 2d Form | 23          | 16               | 15        | 11               | 65            |
| 1st "   | 10          | 6                | 5         | 1                | 22            |

The recurrence of *ἔχων* illustrates the tendency of this form to express an abiding condition. The frequent employment of *γινόμενος* and *ᾧν* arises from the fact that in Plato's time these two words represented fundamentally opposing views of the universe, which Plato made it his business to reconcile. If it were needful to use *γίγνεσθαι* of something which had real existence, the speaker, to avoid ambiguity, must employ *εἶναι* in the emphatic position with *γινόμενος*, *e. g.* Tim. 38 B; Parm. 152 B. Again, were it necessary to speak of a thing coming into real existence, *γίγνεσθαι* would have to be used in the emphatic position with *ᾧν*; *e. g.* Soph. 237 A; 245 D. Finally, even more frequently, lest *εἶναι* should be taken in the loose popular sense, *εἶναι ὅν* is employed in reference to absolute existence, *e. g.* Phaedr. 247 D. The periphrases of these participles, however, are not confined to questions of 'being'; Prot. 356 A, Pol. 301 D. The cases in which *λεγόμενος* appears arise from the need of using a pregnant *εἶναι*. Nom. 881 B, *ἔστω δὲ λεγόμενον τὸ μετὰ τοῦτο τῇδε*. Here there is no

emphasis on the *act*, but to an abiding condition, "Let the next topic stand expressed in the following way." Nom. 773 F, *περὶ γάμων δὴ ταῦτ' ἔστω παραμύθια λεγόμενα*, "Let these things be granted to be," etc. Rep. 588 B, *ἦν δέ που λεγόμενον*, "It was laid down in the course of the discussion" (cf. use of *ἦν* in Aristotle, etc., of a definition which has been arrived at and still holds). Rep. 490 A; Pol. 302 C; Tim. 90 E. Somewhat different are Phil. 11 B; 26 E, cf. Nom. 961 D; Soph. 257 D. In Nom. 855 A *λεγόμενος* is added as an afterthought. Other examples of pregnant use of *εἶναι* are Nom. 763 C and 770 C (where *ἦν* is used of a conclusion reached in a former part of the discussion); Nom. 959 E, *ἔστω πρότερον ἡμῖν τὰ περὶ σώματος καὶ ψυχῆς ὄντα*, "Let us presuppose that bodily and spiritual things really exist," cf. 963 A. It is *ἔστι* that gives the *raison d'être* of the periphr. in Nom. 895 E, *ἔστι που δίχα διαιρούμενον*. . . . "There exists a twofold division," cf. Tim. 77 E. The participle is quite secondary in such passages as Rep. 431 E, *ἐν ταύτῃ ἂν εἴη τοῦτο ἐνόν*, cf. Soph. 257 D; Nom. 870 D. To show the entirely secondary place which characterization may have in this form, we cite Nom. 692 B, *τοῖς τότε νομοθέταις, οἵτινες ἄρ' ἦσαν νομοθετοῦντες*, for, if the idea of characterization were the main one, the relative clause would be tautological, but it is in *ἦσαν* we find the reason for the periphrasis, "the lawgivers who *were actually* engaged in legislation." Again in Phaedo 118 A, *ἦν ψυχόμενα*, 'was actually growing cold,' is used antithetically to the jailer's assertion as to what would take place. In one case, Nom. 768 A, I cannot satisfactorily account for the periphr. unless there be an anacoluthon. The other passages least easily accounted for are Euthyph. 5 E; Nom. 729 B; 800 C.<sup>1</sup>

I will conclude the discussion of periphrases containing the present participle with a summary as regards the use of these combinations in the authors examined. Periphrases of the first form, as well as of the second form in as far as they resemble the others in function, were not employed in ordinary speech except in the case of certain thoroughly adjectivized participles, to which the few cases found in Lysias, Andocides and Isocrates are confined. In other cases the combination was felt to do some violence to the language, and becomes more harsh as the meaning of the participle lends itself less easily to being conceived as a quality; hence

<sup>1</sup>Again I cite excluded cases which may be open to doubt, Meno 84 A; cf. Lys. 204 B; Cleit. 409 E; Rep. 581 E; cf. 478 C and Parm. 136 A; Pol. 271 A (Camp. *ad loc.*)

the three groups into which I divided the cases mark stages of increasing difficulty. Only four cases of the third group occur in the Orators, and three of these, as might be expected, in Demosthenes. A parallel adjective preceding mediates the use of the participle, but even examples of this kind are not common and are confined to Isocrates, Aeschines and Demosthenes, the first-named employing only the easiest combinations. In the second form we find cases which do not differ essentially from those of the first form, and, having the same function, have the same limitations. There is further observable a tendency to use this form in the case of verbs which express an abiding condition, particularly ἔχειν. In general the more emphatic and pregnant the εἶναι becomes, the easier is the combination, since there is an approximation to the ordinary use of a participle of circumstance. Hence in these cases there is greater freedom and a wider range of participles. Thucydides resembles the Orators in his usage. His periphrases of the first form are of the ordinary kind, into which adjectivized participles enter. In those of the second form he is bolder, but only where the stress of meaning is upon the verb. In the pregnant style of Thucydides we should have expected striking cases, but he has adopted another method for expressing characteristic, viz. the use of a periphrasis containing verbal substantives in -της. Plato exhibits a very free and accurate use of participial periphrases, as was to be expected in a philosophic writer. They are more frequent in the later and more scientific dialogues, Sophistes, Politicus, Parmenides, Phileus and Timaeus, but the Nomoi and Epinomis (comprising about 20 per cent. of the whole of Plato examined) contain 41 per cent. of periphrasis, an increase far beyond the demands of the subject-matter.

#### AORIST PARTICIPLE.

If the theory advanced in this paper be true, periphrases containing aorist participles are not *a priori* to be expected, unless in exceptional cases. Of the three tenses the aorist is fixed most closely to the expression of the actual occurrence of a definite act. It is particular and individual; even the gnomic aorist generalizes through the particular. Accordingly, the aorist participle is not usually placed like the pres. and pf., as an attribute between article and noun. It is true, such phrases as οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀποκτείνας are characteristic, but the characterization consists in the identification of two individuals οὗτος and ὁ ἀποκτείνας, hence the article. οὗτός



ἔστιν ἀποκτείνας, on the other hand, does not normally occur, since here ἀποκτείνας would have to be conceived as a generalized characteristic, a conception to which the aorist is in its essence opposed. I have noted a few cases of aorist periphrases which on examination, however, only serve to confirm the conclusions already attained. In the Orators I have noted 4 cases. Two of these occur close together in Ant. 3, 8, 4 and 5 : ὁ παιδοτρίβης ἂν ἀποκτείνας αὐτὸν εἴη and τὸ μὲν μειράκιον οὐδενὸς μᾶλλον τῶν συμμελετώντων ἐστὶ τοῦ σκοποῦ ἁμαρτόν. In the former of these passages the insertion of the article with ἀποκτείνας is not difficult, but in the second the change is less easy. It is true τό might easily have fallen out between ἐστὶ and τοῦ, but the writer would scarcely have said τὸ ἁμαρτόν but ὁ ἁμαρτόν, and thus we should have to account for a double corruption. There is, moreover, good reason for the omission of the article, and I should be unwilling to make the change in either case. In this tetralogy, the prosecution seeks to show that the defendant is ὁ ἀποκτείνας and ὁ ἁμαρτόν. Now the very use of these terms implies the existence of such a person or persons, and from the peculiar circumstances of the case (for which from lack of space I must refer to the speeches themselves), had the defence admitted the existence of such a person, their client must have been that person. In the absence of an indefinite article, then, they are forced to employ the aor. partic. as a characterizing adjective.<sup>1</sup> The other two cases are in Dem. 21 and are introduced by a parallel noun or adjective: 156, . καγὼ μὲν ἐθελοντῆς νῦν, οὗτος δὲ καταστάς ἐξ ἀντιδόσεως τότε where καταστάς is for ὁ καταστάς, the article having been omitted under the influence of the parallel anarthrous noun. 114, οὕτω τοίνυν οὗτός ἐστιν ἀσεβὴς καὶ μιὰρὸς καὶ πᾶν ἂν ὑποστάς εἰπεῖν . . . affords confirmation of the view that the aorist does not lend itself to the expression of characteristic. The nature of the signification of the verb brings about the use of the aor. in preference to the pres., but the writer feeling that ὑποστάς was not fitted to express characteristic, annexed the ἂν and thus gave the requisite generalizing force.

Let us now pass to Plato. The phrase μὴ ἀπαρηθεῖς γένῃ, Soph. 217 C, is an evident imitation of tragic style (cf. Soph. Ajax 588; Philoct. 772) and need not detain us here. The remaining 7 cases are all of the second form and parallel to those periphrases of the pres. partic. where the *raison d'être* lies in the so-called auxiliary and the

<sup>1</sup> In 2 γ 8, the ὁ lacking before ἀποκτείνας in the MSS has been inserted, rightly I believe, by the editors.

characterizing force of the participle is absent. The partic. bears the same relation to the εἶναι (γίγνεσθαι) as it would bear to φαίνεσθαι, and, as contrasted with the finite form, the periphrasis marks two stages, that of the action itself, by the participle, and that of the ascertainment, by the verb, *e. g.* Nom. 737 C, ὄγκος δὲ πλήθους ἱκανὸς οὐκ ἄλλως ὀρθῶς γίγνεται ἂν λεχθεὶς . . . 'would not turn out to have been rightly calculated.' So 866 D ; 867 C ; 739 E.<sup>1</sup> Again, Pol. 289 A draws more attention than the finite form would have done, to the position of matters subsequent to the act of 'placing.' So Nom. 957 C ; Tim. 47 CD. It will be noted that this form of expression is not common, no examples in the Orators, and 5 of all in the Nomoi. In addition there are 4 cases in Plato where an adjective precedes ; Nom. 711 D is a case with ἄν, parallel to Dem. 21, 114 already explained. Nom. 913 C is similar to 737 C discussed above. Nom. 829 CD is a case of the aorist being used for a pf. under the influence of the negative. Phil. 51 A is exceptional : πρὸς τὸ τιναὶ ἡδονὰς εἶναι δοκούσας, οὕσας δὲ οὐδαμῶς, καὶ μεγάλας ἑτέρας τιναὶ ἅμα καὶ πολλὰς φαντασθείσας, εἶναι δ' αὐτὰς συμπεφυρμένας ὁμοῦ λύπαις . . . Here the writer does violence to the language to express a special meaning. *φαντασθείσας* is characteristic and the present participle would have been expected, but then the natural interpretation would have been, that these pleasures present many appearances at one and the same time, whereas he wishes to say that they underwent continual change and presented many appearances *in succession*. He therefore uses the ingressive aorist, the characterizing force being sufficiently marked by the neighborhood of the participles and adjective.<sup>2</sup>

#### PERFECT PARTICIPLE.

The perfect tense has a two-fold aspect ; in addition to predicating an activity, it predicates an abiding result of that activity. This latter factor may be regarded as an attribute of the thing affected, as a quality which has been generated in the thing. A pf. participle, we conclude then, approaches an adjective closely ; but they differ, inasmuch as the adjective presents a quality merely

<sup>1</sup> The partic. in 739 E might be construed as an ordinary partic. with the subject, but the other is preferable.

<sup>2</sup> I note as before some rejected cases ; in [Lys.] 20, 1, αὐτῶν is predicate, 'for some, having plotted, joined them' ; Phil. 64 B, cf. Phaedr. 245 E ; Pol. 265 D ; Nom. 740 B ; 961 BC ; in Nom. 844 D the partic. is an afterthought ; Pol. 272 D, corrupt ; Theag. 123 A, mark of late origin.

from the point of view of its existence, the pf. participle has regard also to its genesis. Of these two sides presented by the pf. tense, either may predominate ; but it must be noted that, while to express the first of these aspects simply we have another tense, the aorist, there is no tense which can assert the second simply. The consequence of this would be that in general, when the pf. itself is used, the main emphasis would lie on the second side—the existence of the result. But we have already seen that periphrasis is exactly fitted for the presentation of such a conception, and hence the very frequent use of periphrasis in the pf. is in accord with the theory all along maintained in this paper. Again, since the result of an action is more likely to be permanently manifest in the object than in the agent, we are not surprised to find periphrasis more common in the middle-passive than in the active ; and again, the use of finite forms for opt. and subj. of pfs. used as presents is also in accord with what has been laid down. From what has been said, any difference between finite and periphrastic forms in the pf. must in any case be evanescent, and in addition to this we have a disintegrating factor in the defectiveness of the pf. paradigm. When *λέλυνται* and *πεπλεγμένοι εἰσὶ* were used in exactly the same temporal sense, it was inevitable that any difference which might exist between *λέλυνται* and *λελυμένοι εἰσὶ* should be obliterated. Doubtless the emphatic pre-position of *εἶναι* was often a determining factor. I do not propose then to examine in detail the cases of pf. periphrasis, it is sufficient to have shown that the phenomena here also are in accordance with the conclusions elsewhere reached.

W. J. ALEXANDER.